

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexascin, Virginia 22313-1450 www.enplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,028	09/17/2003	Soo-hong Park	Q76745	2599
23373 SUGHRUE M	7590 12/17/200 ION PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
···IoIII··oio	., 50 2005	2454		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/664,028	PARK, SOO-HONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DUSTIN NGUYEN	2454	

	DUSTIN NGUYEN	2454	l
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	vhich places the r (3) a Request
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period act under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office ther may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the pr	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	cplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-9.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
	/DUSTIN NGUYEN/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2454	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: n response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "identifying using an IPNe address" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the memble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight twelver the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

In response to applicant's argument that the applied art does not disclose using the unused area among the company ID area to represent device ID information. The Examiner had addressed this argument in previous Office Action

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 299 (CCPA 1971).